arXiv:1010.5366v1 [math.PR] 26 Oct 2010

# Some sufficient conditions for infinite collisions of simple random walks on a wedge comb

Xinxing Chen* and Dayue Chen†

October 27, 2010

## Abstract

In this paper, we give some sufficient conditions for the infinite collisions of independent simple random walks on a wedge comb with profile $\{f(n), n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. One interesting result is that if $f(n)$ has a growth order as $n \log n$, then two independent simple random walks on the wedge comb will collide infinitely many times. Another is that if $\{f(n); n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are given by i.i.d. non-negative random variables with finite mean, then for almost all wedge comb with such profile, three independent simple random walks on it will collide infinitely many times.

**2000 MR subject classification:** 60K

**Key words:** wedge comb, random walk, infinite collision property, local time

# 1 Introduction

A simple random walk on a graph is defined as the Markov chain that a particle jumps from one vertex to a neighbor with equal probability. Let $X = (X_n)$ and $X' = (X'_n)$ be two independent simple random walks starting from the same vertex. We say that $X$ and $X'$ collide infinitely often if $|\{n : X_n = X'_n\}| = \infty$. If $X$ and $X'$ almost surely collide infinitely often, then we say that the graph has the infinite

---

*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, China

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, China

collision property. While if $X$ and $X'$ almost surely collide finitely many times, then we say that the graph has the finite collision property. Krishnapur and Peres [5] first finds the example Comb($\mathbb{Z}$) on which two simple random random walks almost surely collide finitely many times, while the expected number of collisions is infinite.

However, there is no simple monotonicity property for the finite collision property, as exemplified by $\mathbb{Z} \subset$Comb($\mathbb{Z}$)$\subset \mathbb{Z}^2$. Both $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^2$ have the infinite collision property but Comb($\mathbb{Z}$) has the finite collision property. So, it is interesting to studying a subgraph of Comb($\mathbb{Z}$).

**Definition.** Let $f$ be a function from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$. It induces a wedge comb Comb$(\mathbb{Z}, f) = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ which has the vertex set

$$\mathbb{V} = \{(x, y) : \ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, -f(x) \leq y \leq f(x)\}$$

and edge set $\{[(x, n), (x, m)] : |m - n| = 1\} \cup \{[(x, 0), (y, 0)] : |x - y| = 1\}$.

Chen, Wei, and Zhang [3] shows that Comb$(\mathbb{Z}, f)$ has the infinite collision property when $f(n) < n^{\frac{1}{5}}$. Recently, Barlow, Peres, Sousi [1] gives a sufficient condition (in terms of Green functions) for infinite collisions and shows that Comb$(\mathbb{Z}, f)$ has the infinite collision property when $f(n) \leq n$; while it has the finite collision property when $f(x) = n^\alpha$ for each $\alpha > 1$. Collisions on other graphes, such as random infinite cluster and random tree, can be seen in [1][2]. In this paper, we focus only on the wedge combs with different profile $f(n)$, and give a sufficient condition for a wedge comb which has the infinite collision property, i.e.,

**Theorem 1.1** *Let* $\breve{f}(n) = 1 \vee \max_{-n \leq i \leq n} f(i)$. *If*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\breve{f}(n)} = \infty, \tag{1.1}$$

*then two simple random walks on Comb*$(\mathbb{Z}, f)$ *will collide infinitely many times with probability one.*

As an directly application of Theorem 1.1, one has

**Corollary 1.1** *If* $f(-n) + f(n) = O(n \log n)$, *then two simple random walks on Comb*$(\mathbb{Z}, f)$ *will collide infinitely many times with probability one.*

Corollary 1.1 improves the result of [3] and [1]. On the other hand, One can compare it with Theorem 4.1, which says that for each $\beta > 2$, if $f(x) = |x| \log^{\beta}(|x| \vee 1)$ then $\mathrm{Comb}(\mathbb{Z}, f)$ has the finite collision property. But we guess that it should still have the finite collision property for $1 < \beta \leq 2$.

A natural question to ask is what happen if there are more than two independent simple random walks. Suppose that $X$ is a simple random walk and $X', X''$ are two independent copies of $X$. We say that $X, X'$ and $X''$ collide together infinitely often if $|\{n : X_n = X'_n = X''_n\}| = \infty$. it shows in [1] that three independent simple random walks on $\mathbb{Z}$ will collide together infinitely many times; while on $\mathrm{Comb}(\mathbb{Z}, \alpha)$ they will do finitely many times for each $\alpha > 0$.

**Theorem 1.2** *Let $\{f(n); n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are independent and identically distributed random variables with law $\mu$ supported in $[0, \infty)$. If $\mu$ has finite mean, then for almost all $f$ three independent simple random walks on Comb($\mathbb{Z}, f$) will collide together infinitely many times with probability one.*

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $X = \{X_n\}$ be a simple random walk on $\mathrm{Comb}(\mathbb{Z}, f)$. Write

$$X_n = (U_n, V_n)$$

for all $n \geq 0$. So that $U$ is a random process on $\mathbb{Z}$. For each $k \geq 0$, we set $T_0 = 0$ and inductively

$$T_{k+1} := \inf\{n > T_k : U_n \neq U_{n-1}\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Then $X_n$ stays at the segment $\{(u, y) : |y| \leq f(u)\}$ when $U_{T_k} = u$ during time $[T_k, T_{k+1} - 1]$. Let

$$W_k = U_{T_k}.$$

It is easy to know such $\{W_k\}$ is a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$ (by the strong Markov property).

For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. For a set $A$, let $|A|$ be the number of elements of $A$. For each $x \in \mathbb{V}$, we write $x_1$ for the first coordinate of $x$, $x_2$ for the second. For each $n$, let

$$\mathbb{V}_n = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{V} : |x_1| \leq n\},$$

and

$$\theta_n = \inf\{m \geq 0 : X_m \notin \mathbb{V}_{n-1}\}.$$

So, if $X_0 \in \mathbb{V}_{n-1}$ then $\theta_n$ is the hitting time of $\{(-n, 0), (n, 0)\}$ (i.e., the boundary of $\mathbb{V}_n$) by $X$.

Let $X'$ be another simple random walk on $\mathrm{Comb}(\mathbb{Z}, f)$, independent of $X$. Define $U'_n, V'_n, W'_k, T'_k, \theta'_n$ as well. For each pair $u, v \in \mathbb{V}$, We write $\mathbf{P}^u$ for the probability measure of a simple random walk $X$ starting from $u$ and write $\mathbf{P}^{u,v}$ for the joint probability measure of the two independent simple random walks $X$ and $X'$ starting from $u$ and $v$, respectively. We also write $\mathbf{E}^u$ and $\mathbf{E}^{u,v}$ for the corresponding expectations. For each $m \geq 0$, set $\sigma_0 = 0$, and inductively

$$\sigma_{m+1} := \inf\{n > \sigma_m : \; U_n = U'_n, \; U_n \neq U_{n-1} \text{ or } U'_n \neq U'_{n-1}\}.$$

**Lemma 2.1** *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist integers $d$ and $N_0$, such that for all $N \geq N_0$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{V}_N$ with $u_1 + u_2 + v_1 + v_2$ even,*

$$\mathbf{P}^{u,v}\left(\sigma_N \geq \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN}\right) < \varepsilon.$$

**Proof.** Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose that $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough and that $u, v \in \mathbb{V}_N$. For each $n \geq 0$, set

$$Z_{2n} = U_n - U'_n \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{2n+1} = U_{n+1} - U'_n.$$

Set $\tau_0 = 0$, and inductively

$$\tau_m = \inf\{n > \tau_{m-1} : Z_n \neq Z_{n-1}\}.$$

By the strong Markov property, $\{Z_{\tau_m}, m \geq 0\}$ is a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$ and

$$Z_{\tau_0} = u_1 - v_1 \in [-2N, 2N]. \tag{2.2}$$

If $Z_{\tau_m} = 0$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_k = U'_k,\ U_k \neq U'_{k-1},\ \tau_m = 2k \ \text{ for } \ \text{some } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+; \ \text{ or} \\
&U_{k+1} = U'_k,\ U_k \neq U'_k,\ \tau_m = 2k+1 \ \text{ for } \ \text{some } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $U_n + V_n + U'_n + V'_n$ is always even under the assumption that $U_0 + V_0 + U'_0 + V'_0 = u_1 + u_2 + v_1 + v_2$ is even. This fact, together with $U_{k+1} = U'_k \neq U_k$, implies that $U_{k+1} = U'_{k+1}$. For each $M \geq 0$, let

$$\xi(0, M) := |\{m : Z_{\tau_m} = 0, 0 \leq m \leq M\}|,$$

the local time of 0 by $\{Z_{\tau_m}, m \geq 0\}$. As a result of the previous argument,

$$\{\xi(0, M) \geq N\} \subseteq \{\sigma_N \leq \tau_M\} \subseteq \{\sigma_N \leq T_M \wedge T'_M\}. \tag{2.3}$$

By (9.11) on Page 39 of [7] and (2.2), there exists $x \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}^{u,v}(\xi(0, xN^2) \leq N) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{2.4}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 2.13 on Page 21 of [7], we can find such $d \in \mathbb{N}$ which satisfies the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}^{u,v}(T_{xN^2} \geq \theta_{dN} \text{ or } T'_{xN^2} \geq \theta'_{dN}) \\
=&\mathbf{P}^{u,v}\left(\max_{0 \leq k \leq xN^2} |W_k| \geq dN \text{ or } \max_{0 \leq k \leq xN^2} |W'_k| \geq dN\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with (2.3) and (2.2), we can get the desired result. □

The above lemma shows that, with a small exception, the number of collisions is bounded by departures times $\theta$ and $\theta'$ of $U$ and $U'$ linearly.

Secondly, we estimate the probability of that there is at least one collision of $X$ and $X'$ once $U$ and $U'$ collide. For every $m \geq 0$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_m = \big\{&X_n = X'_n,\ |V_n| + |V'_n| \geq |V_{\sigma_m}| + |V'_{\sigma_m}| \\
&\text{for some } \sigma_m \leq n < \inf\{h > \sigma_m : V_h = 0 \text{ or } V'_h = 0\}\big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that if $X_{\sigma_m} = X'_{\sigma_m}$ then $\Psi_m$ occurs. Moreover for every $(u,0),(u,v) \in \mathbb{V}$ with $v$ being even, if $\Psi_m \cap \{X_{\sigma_m} = (u,0), X'_{\sigma_m} = (u,v)\}$ occurs then $X$ enters the segment $L = \{(u,x) : 1 \le x \le f(u)\}$ and collides with $X'_n$ at a height not less than $v/2$ after time $\sigma_m$ but before one of them leaving $L$. Here, by height we mean the second component of a vertex $x \in \mathbb{V}$. We need these events in order to have good bounds as follows.

**Lemma 2.2** *There exist positive numbers $c_1$ and $c_2$ such that for all $(u,v) \in \mathbb{V}$ with $v$ being even,*

$$\frac{c_1}{|v| \vee 1} \le \mathbf{P}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(\Psi_0) \le \frac{c_2}{|v| \vee 1}.$$

**Proof.** First let us examine the case that $f(u) \ge 2v$ and $v$ is even. For each $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\tau_x = \inf\{n > 0 : X_n = (u,x)\}.$$

Define $\tau'_x$ similarly. If $\tau_{2v} \le \tau_0$ and $X'$ stay in $[v/2, 3v/2]$ before time $\tau_{2v}$, then $X$ and $X'$ must collide before $\tau_{2v} \le \tau_0 \wedge \tau'_0$ at a vertex whose height is greater than or equal to $v/2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(\Psi_0) \ge & \mathbf{P}^{(u,0),(u,v)}\left(X_1 = (u,1),\ \tau_{2v} \le v^2 \wedge \tau_0,\ \tau'_{v/2} \vee \tau'_{3v/2} \ge v^2\right) \\ = & \mathbf{P}^{(u,0)}(X_1 = (u,1))\mathbf{P}^{(u,1)}\left(\tau_{2v} < v^2, \tau_{2v} \le \tau_0\right)\mathbf{P}^{(u,v)}\left(\tau_{v/2} \vee \tau_{3v/2} \ge v^2\right) \\ \ge & \frac{1}{4}\mathbf{P}^{(u,1)}\left(\tau_{2v} < v^2, \tau_{2v} \le \tau_0\right)\mathbf{P}^{(u,v)}\left(\tau_{v/2} \vee \tau_{3v/2} \ge v^2\right). \qquad (2.5)\end{aligned}$$

Once $X$ enters into the segment $L$, by observation, the behavior of $V$, the second component of $X$, before $V$ hitting 0, has the same law as a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z} \cap [0, f(u)]$. Let $\{\eta_i\}$ be i.i.d. random variables with

$$\mathbf{P}(\eta_1 = 1) = \mathbf{P}(\eta_1 = -1) = 1/2,$$

and

$$\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} = \inf\left\{k > 0 : 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \eta_i \ge 2v\right\}, \quad \widetilde{\tau}_0 = \inf\left\{k > 0 : 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \eta_i \le 0\right\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{P}^{(u,1)}\left(\tau_{2v} < v^2, \tau_{2v} \le \tau_0\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} < v^2, \widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le \widetilde{\tau}_0\right). \tag{2.6}$$

Obviously, $\{\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le v^2\}$ and $\{\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le \widetilde{\tau}_0\}$ are both increasing event. By the FKG inequality,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le v^2, \widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le \widetilde{\tau}_0\right) \ge \mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le v^2)\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le \widetilde{\tau}_0). \tag{2.7}$$

By Lemma 3.1 of [7],

$$\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le \widetilde{\tau}_0) = \frac{1}{2v}. \tag{2.8}$$

By Theorem 2.13 of [7] again, there exists $c_1 > 0$ independently of $u$ and $v$, such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{2v} \le v^2) \ge c_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{P}^{(u,v)}\left(\tau_{v/2} \vee \tau_{3v/2} \ge v^2\right) \ge c_1. \tag{2.9}$$

Taking (2.5)-(2.9) together, we obtain the first inequality of the lemma.

$$\mathbf{P}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(\Psi_0) \ge \frac{c_1^2}{8v}. \tag{2.10}$$

Now we turn to proving the second inequality. Define

$$H = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 1_{\{V_n = V'_n,\ n < \tau_0 \wedge \tau'_0\}},$$

the number of collisions of $X$ and $X'$ before one of them leaving $L$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(H) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{x=1}^{f(u)} \mathbf{P}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(V_n = V'_n = x,\ n \le \tau_0 \wedge \tau'_0) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{x=1}^{f(u)} \mathbf{P}^{(u,0)}(V_n = x,\ n \le \tau_0)\mathbf{P}^{(u,v)}(V_n = x,\ n \le \tau_0) \\
&\le 2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{x=1}^{f(u)} \mathbf{P}^{(u,0)}(X_n = (u,x),\ n \le \tau_0)\mathbf{P}^{(u,x)}(V_n = v,\ n \le \tau_0) \\
&\le 2\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}^{(u,0)}(V_{2n} = v,\ 2n \le \tau_0) \\
&= 2\mathbf{E}^{(u,0)}(\text{ number of visits to } (u,v) \text{ by } X \text{ before returning to } (u,0)\ ).
\end{aligned}$$

In the previous arguments, the first inequality follows by the knowledge of reversible Markov chain that for all $x \in [1, f(u)] \cap \mathbb{Z}$

$$\mathbf{P}^{(u,v)}(V_n = x,\ n \le \tau_0) \le 2\mathbf{P}^{(u,x)}(V_n = v,\ n \le \tau_0).$$

By Theorem 9.7 of [7],

$$\mathbf{E}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(H) \le 2. \tag{2.11}$$

The second inequality will follow once we show that there exists $c_2 > 0$ independent of $u, v$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H|\Psi_0) \ge c_2 v. \tag{2.12}$$

Since we condition on the event $\Psi_0$, there is a collision at position $x = (u, w)$ for some $w$ with $w \ge v/2$. Conditioned on this event, the total number of collisions that happen in the set $\{(u, h) : h \ge v/3\}$, will be greater than the number of collisions that take place before the first time that one of the random walks exits this interval. The lower bound could be obtained by the following consideration.

Consider two independent simple random walks in an interval, starting at $v/2$. Before hitting either $v/3$ or $2v/3$, the average number of collisions is the number of average number of returning to the starting point before exiting the interval. The average number of returning to the starting point is exactly the Green function of a simple random walk, starting at $v/2$, before exiting the interval $(v/3, 2v/3)$, which is of order $v$.

By (2.11) and (2.12), we have

$$\mathbf{P}^{(u,0),(u,v)}(\Psi_0) \le \frac{2}{c_2 v}.$$

This completes the proof of the case that $f(u) \ge 2v$ and $v$ is even. The proof can be modified to treat other cases and is omitted here. $\square$

By Lemma 2.1, we can find $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $N \ge N_0$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{V}_N$ with $u_1 + u_2 + v_1 + v_2$ even,

$$\mathbf{P}^{u,v}\left(\sigma_N \ge \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN}\right) < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.13}$$

Fix $d$ through this section. To be concise, we set

$$\breve{f}(n) = 1 \vee \max_{-n \leq i \leq n} f(i).$$

As a result, $\breve{f}(n)$ is a strictly positive and increasing function on $\mathbb{Z}^+$.

**Lemma 2.3** *There exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c > 0$, such that for all $N \geq N_0$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{V}_N$ with $u_1 + u_2 + v_1 + v_2$ even,*

$$\mathbf{P}^{u,v}\big(X_n = X'_n \text{ for some } n \in [0, \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN})\big) \geq \frac{cN}{\breve{f}(dN) + N}.$$

**Proof.** Let

$$H = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \big(|V_{\sigma_m}| \vee |V'_{\sigma_m}| \vee 1\big) 1_{\Psi_m} 1_{\{\sigma_m < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN}\}}.$$

As a result of that, if $H > 0$ then $X$ and $X'$ collide before they break out of $\mathbb{V}_{dN}$. We shall use the second moment method to estimate the probability of the occurrence of $\{H > 0\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{N} \mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left( (|V_{\sigma_m}| \vee |V'_{\sigma_m}| \vee 1) 1_{\Psi_m} 1_{\{\sigma_m < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN}\}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{N} \mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left( \mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left( (|V_{\sigma_m}| \vee |V'_{\sigma_m}| \vee 1) 1_{\Psi_m} 1_{\{\sigma_m < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN}\}} \;\Big|\; X_i, X'_i, 0 \leq i \leq \sigma_m \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{N} \mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left( (|V_{\sigma_m}| \vee |V'_{\sigma_m}| \vee 1) \mathbf{P}^{u,v}\left( \Psi_m \;\big|\; X_i, X'_i, 0 \leq i \leq \sigma_m \right); \sigma_m < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN} \right) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{N} \mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left( (|V_{\sigma_m}| \vee |V'_{\sigma_m}| \vee 1) \mathbf{P}^{X_{\sigma_m}, X'_{\sigma_m}}\left( \Psi_0 \right); \sigma_m < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN} \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{m=1}^{N} \mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left( c_1; \sigma_m < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN} \right) \\
&\geq c_1 N \mathbf{P}^{u,v}(\sigma_N < \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN}) \\
&\geq \frac{c_1}{2} N,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by (2.13); the last three inequality is by Lemma 2.2 and the last equation is by the strong Markov property. Using Lemma 2.2 and the strong Markov property again, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H^2)\\
=&\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{N}(|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\sum_{n=1}^{N}(|V_{\sigma_n}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_n}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_n}1_{\{\sigma_n<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\right)\\
=&\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{N}(|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)^2 1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\right)\\
&\quad+2\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{N}(|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\sum_{n>m}^{N}(|V_{\sigma_n}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_n}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_n}1_{\{\sigma_n<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\right)\\
\le&2\breve{f}(dN)\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{N}(|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\right)\\
&\quad+2\sum_{m=1}^{N}\sum_{n>m}^{N}\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left((|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}(|V_{\sigma_n}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_n}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_n}1_{\{\sigma_n<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\right)\\
=&2\breve{f}(dN)\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H)+2\sum_{m=1}^{N}\sum_{n>m}^{N}\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\big((|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\times\ (|V_{\sigma_n}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_n}|\vee 1)\mathbf{P}^{X_{\sigma_n},X'_{\sigma_n}}(\Psi_0)1_{\{\sigma_n<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\big)\\
\le&2\breve{f}(dN)\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H)+2c_2\sum_{m=1}^{N}\sum_{n>m}^{N}\mathbf{E}^{u,v}\left((|V_{\sigma_m}|\vee|V'_{\sigma_m}|\vee 1)1_{\Psi_m}1_{\{\sigma_m<\theta_{dN}\wedge\theta'_{dN}\}}\right)\\
\le&(2\breve{f}(dN)+2c_2N)\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H).
\end{aligned}
$$

So that by the Hölder inequality,

$$
\mathbf{P}^{u,v}(H>0)\ge\frac{[\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H)]^2}{\mathbf{E}^{u,v}[H^2]}\ge\frac{\mathbf{E}^{u,v}(H)}{2\breve{f}(dN)+2c_2N}\ge\frac{c_1N}{4\breve{f}(dN)+4c_2N}.
$$

Hence we have the result. □

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* We need only to prove the case that two independent simple random walks on Comb($\mathbb{Z}, f$) starting from the same vertex $(0,0)$. So, simply write

$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{(0,0),(0,0)}$. For each $m \geq 1$, define

$$\Upsilon_m = \{X_n = X'_n \quad \text{for some} \quad n \in [\theta_{d^m} \wedge \theta'_{d^m}, \theta_{d^{m+1}} \wedge \theta'_{d^{m+1}})\}.$$

Notice that for all $0 \leq n \leq \theta_{d^m} \wedge \theta'_{d^m}$,

$$X_n, X'_n \in \mathbb{V}_{d^m}.$$

So, by the strong Markov property and Lemma 2.3, there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $m$ large enough

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}(\Upsilon_m |\ 1_{\Upsilon_i}, 1 \leq i < m,\ X_n, X'_n,\ n \leq \theta_{d^m} \wedge \theta'_{d^m}) \\ =&\mathbf{P}^{X_t, X'_t}\big(X_n = X'_n \quad \text{for some} \quad n \in [0, \theta_{d^{m+1}} \wedge \theta'_{d^{m+1}})\big) \\ \geq& \frac{c d^{m+1}}{\breve{f}(d^{m+1}) + d^{m+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $t = \theta_{d^m} \wedge \theta'_{d^m}$. We shall show later that (1.1) implies

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{d^m}{\breve{f}(d^m) + d^m} = \infty. \tag{2.14}$$

If (2.14) holds, then by the second Borel Cantelli Lemma (extend version, Page 237 of [4]),

$$\mathbf{P}(\ \Upsilon_m \quad \text{infinitely} \quad \text{often}\ ) = 1.$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n = X'_n \quad \text{infinitely} \quad \text{often}\ ) \geq \mathbf{P}(\ \Upsilon_m \quad \text{infinitely} \quad \text{often}\ ) = 1.$$

Now we prove that (2.14) holds. If $\breve{f}(d^m) \leq d^m$ for infinitely many $m$, then (2.14) holds obviously. Otherwise, there exists $m_0$ such that for all $m \geq m_0$,

$$\breve{f}(d^m) > d^m.$$

Hence to prove (2.14), we need only to prove

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{d^m}{\breve{f}(d^m)} = \infty. \tag{2.15}$$

Set $S_m = d + d^2 + \cdots + d^m$. Then

$$d^m \leq S_m \leq d^{m+1}.$$

As a result,

$$\frac{d^m}{\breve{f}(d^m)} \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{l=S_m+1}^{S_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\breve{f}(l)}.$$

So

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{d^m}{\breve{f}(d^m)} \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=S_m+1}^{S_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\breve{f}(l)} \geq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{l=d+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\breve{f}(l)} = \infty.$$

Such we completed the proof of Theorem 1.1. $\square$

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Theorem 1.2 will follow once we show the following result.

**Theorem 3.1** *If*

$$\sum_{i=-n}^{n} f(i) = O(n),$$

*then three independent simple random walks on Comb($\mathbb{Z}, f$) will collide together infinitely many times with probability one.*

Let $X''$ be another independent simple random walk on Comb$(\mathbb{Z}, f)$. For each $u, v, w \in \mathbb{V}$, we write $\mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}$ for the joint probability measure of the three independent simple random walks $X, X'$ and $X''$ starting from $u, v$ and $w$, respectively. We write $\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}$ for the corresponding expectation.

By the condition of Theorem 3.1, there exists $c > 2$, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$\sum_{i=-n}^{n} f(i) \leq \left(\frac{c}{2} - 2\right) n. \tag{3.1}$$

We fix $f$ and $c$ which satisfy (3.1) through this section. Since

$$[-n, n] \times \{0\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^2 \subseteq \mathbb{V}_n \subseteq \bigcup_{i=-n}^{n} [-f(i), f(i)] \times \{i\},$$

one has

$$2n \le |\mathbb{V}_n| \le cn. \tag{3.2}$$

For each $x \in \mathbb{V}$, let

$$\tau_x = \inf\{m \ge 0 : \ X_m = x\},$$

the hitting time of $x$ by $X$. Similarly, we have he following estimates.

**Lemma 3.1** *For any $c_1 > 0$, there exist $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \ge n_0$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{V}_n$,*

$$\mathbf{P}^u(\theta_{dn} \le n^2) \le c_1,$$

*and*

$$\mathbf{P}^u\big(\tau_v > c_2 n^2\big) \le c_1,$$

**Proof.** Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is large enough and is fixed. Fix $u, v \in \mathbb{V}_n$ and $c_1 \in R$. Assume further that $0 < c_1 < 1/5$.

The first statement is obvious. By Theorem 2.13 of [7], there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $d > 2$ and is independent of $n$ and $u$, such that

$$\mathbf{P}^u(\theta_{dn} \le n^2) \le \mathbf{P}^u\left(\max_{0 \le k \le n^2} |W_k| \ge dn\right) \le c_1. \tag{3.3}$$

We now prove the second statement. By the strong Markov property,

$$\mathbf{P}^u(\tau_v \le (c_2 + c_4)n^2) \ge \mathbf{P}^u(\tau_{\widetilde{u}} \le c_2 n^2)\mathbf{P}^{\widetilde{u}}(\tau_v \le T_{c_3 n^2}, \ T_{c_3 n^2} \le c_4 n^2).$$

To prove the second result, we need only to prove that there exist $c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c_4 > 0$ which are independent of $n$ and $u$ and satisfy (3.4)-(3.6) as follows. Here $\widetilde{u} = (u_1, 0)$ and $T_k$ is defined in (2.1).

$$\mathbf{P}^u(\tau_{\widetilde{u}} > c_2 n^2) \le c_1; \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathbf{P}^{\widetilde{u}}(\tau_v > T_{c_3 n^2}) \le c_1; \tag{3.5}$$

$$\mathbf{P}^{\widetilde{u}}(T_{c_3 n^2} > c_4 n^2) \le 3c_1. \tag{3.6}$$

Once we verify that (3.4)-(3.6) hold, then

$$\mathbf{P}^u(\tau_v \le (c_2 + c_4)n^2) \ge 1 - 5c_1.$$

Now we prove (3.4)-(3.6) one by one. First, since $u \in \mathbb{V}_n$,

$$f(u_1) \le \frac{cn}{2}.$$

The process $X$ starting from $u$ stays at the segment $\{(u_1, y) : |y| \le f(u_1)\}$ before reaching $\widetilde{u}$. So its behavior before reaching $\widetilde{u}$ is much like a simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$. As a result of that, we can find such $c_2$ as the requirement of (3.4).

Next, for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let

$$\xi(x, n) = |\{k : W_k = x, 0 \le k \le n\}|$$

the local time of $x$ before time $n$ by $W$. By Theorem 9.4 and (9.11) of [7], for any $c_1^*, c_2^* > 0$ there exist $c_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ independent of $u, v$ and $n$ but depending on $c_1^*$ and $c_2^*$, such that

$$\mathbf{P}^{\widetilde{u}}(\xi(v_1, c_3 n^2) \ge c_2^* n) \ge 1 - c_1^*. \tag{3.7}$$

By a similar argument as Lemma 2.2, we can get

$$\mathbf{P}^{(v_1,0)}(X_n = v \text{ for some } n \in [0, T_1)) \ge \frac{1}{4f(v_1) + 1} \ge \frac{1}{4cn}. \tag{3.8}$$

If we let $c_1^*$ small enough and $c_2^*$ large enough, then by (3.7),(3.8) and a proof as Theorem 1.1, we can find $c_3$ for (3.5).

Finally, we estimate $T_n$. Let

$$\xi(n) = \max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi(x, n).$$

According to Theorem 9.14 and (10.6) of [7], there exists $c_1^* > 0$ independent of $u$ and $n$ such that,

$$\mathbf{P}^{\widetilde{u}}(\xi(c_3 n^2) > c_1^* n) \le c_1. \tag{3.9}$$

For each $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$D_k^x = \inf\big\{T_l : T_l > \inf\{n : \xi(x, n) = k\}\big\} - \inf\{n : \xi(x, n) = k\}.$$

Hence $D_k^x$ is the time spent on the line segment $\{(x,y) : |y| \le f(x)\}$ at the $k$-th visit $x$ by $W$. Obviously, $\{D_k^x, k \ge 1\}$ are independent and identically distributed. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{E}^{\widetilde{u}}(D_k^x) = \mathbf{E}^{(x_1,0)}(D_1^x) \le 2f(x) + 1. \tag{3.10}$$

Condition on $V_0 = 0$, for all $n$ there has

$$T_n \le \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k=1}^{\xi(x,n)} D_k^x. \tag{3.11}$$

By (3.1), (3.10) and (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}^{\widetilde{u}}(T_{c_3 n^2}; \theta_{c_3 dn} \ge c_3 n^2, \xi(c_3 n^2) \le c_1^* n) \\
\le &\mathbf{E}^{\widetilde{u}}\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k=1}^{\xi(x,c_3n^2)} D_k^x;\ \theta_{c_3dn} \ge c_3 n^2, \xi(c_3 n^2) \le c_1^* n\right) \\
\le &\mathbf{E}^{\widetilde{u}}\left(\sum_{x=-c_3dn}^{c_3dn} \sum_{k=1}^{c_1^* n} D_k^x;\ \theta_{c_3dn} \ge c_3 n^2, \xi(c_3 n^2) \le c_1^* n\right) \\
\le &\sum_{x=-c_3dn}^{c_3dn} \sum_{k=1}^{c_1^* n} \mathbf{E}^{\widetilde{u}}(D_k^x) \le c_1^* n \sum_{x=-c_3dn}^{c_3dn} (2f(x)+1) \\
\le &3c_1^* c_3 c d n^2
\end{aligned}$$

By the Markov inequality

$$\mathbf{P}^{\widetilde{u}}(T_{c_3n^2} > 3c_1^{-1} c_1^* c_3 c d n^2; \theta_{c_3dn} \ge c_3 n^2, \xi(c_3n^2) \le c_1^* n) \le c_1.$$

This, together with (3.3) and (3.9), verifies (3.6). We have completed the proof. □

By Lemma 3.1, we can find $c_2, d \in \mathbb{N}$, such that there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $n \ge n_0$ and all $u, x \in \mathbb{V}_n$,

$$\mathbf{P}^u(\tau_x > c_2 n^2) \le \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}^u(\theta_{dn} \le c_2 n^2) \le \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.12}$$

**Lemma 3.2** *There exist $c_5 > 0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any integer $N > N_0$ and all $u, v, w \in \mathbb{V}_N$ with $(-1)^{u_1+u_2} = (-1)^{v_1+v_2} = (-1)^{w_1+w_2}$,*

$$\mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}\left(X_n = X_n' = X_n'' \text{ for some } n \in \left[0,\ \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta_{dN}' \wedge \theta_{dN}''\right)\right) \ge \frac{c_5}{\log N}.$$

**Proof.** Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For conciseness, we write

$$\Theta = \theta_{dN} \wedge \theta'_{dN} \wedge \theta''_{dN} = \inf\big\{m \geq 0 : \{X_m, X'_m, X''_m\} \not\subseteq \mathbb{V}_{dN-1}\big\}.$$

Then $\Theta$ is the first time that one of $X^*$ breaks out of $\mathbb{V}_{dN-1}$. Let

$$H = \sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2} 1_{\{X_n = X'_n = X''_n \in \mathbb{V}_N,\ \Theta > n\}}.$$

We need only to prove

$$\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H) \geq c_1^* \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H^2) \leq c_2^* \mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H) \log N. \tag{3.13}$$

Then by Hölder inequality,

$$\mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}(X_n = X'_n = X''_n \text{ for some } n \leq \Theta) \geq \mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}(H > 0) \geq \frac{\big[\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)\big]^2}{\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}\big(H^2\big)} \geq \frac{c_1^*}{c_2^* \log N}.$$

Now we prove (3.13). Let

$$q_n(u, x) = \mathbf{P}^u(X_n = x, \theta_{dN} > n).$$

Then $q_{2n}(x, x)$ is decreasing in $n$ for every $x \in \mathbb{V}_N$ (Refer to [1]). By the strong Markov property, for each $u, x \in \mathbb{V}_N$ and $c_2N^2 \leq n \leq 2c_2N^2$ with $u_1+u_2+x_1+x_2+n$ even

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}^u(X_n = x, \theta_{dN} > n) =& \mathbf{P}^u(X_n = x, \tau_x \leq n < \theta_{dN}) \\
=& \mathbf{E}^u(\mathbf{P}^x(X_{n-k} = x, \theta_{dN} > n)|_{\tau_x = k}; \tau_x \leq n, \theta_{dN} > \tau_x) \\
=& \mathbf{E}^u(q_{n-\tau_x}(x, x); \tau_x \leq n, \theta_{dN} > \tau_x) \\
\geq& q_{2c_2N^2}(x, x) \mathbf{P}^u(\tau_x \leq n, \theta_{dN} > \tau_x) \\
\geq& q_{2c_2N^2}(x, x)\big(\mathbf{P}^u(\tau_x \leq c_2N^2) + \mathbf{P}^u(\theta_{dN} > c_2N^2) - 1\big).
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.12),

$$\mathbf{P}^u(X_n = x, \theta_{dN} > n) \geq \frac{1}{2} q_{2c_2N^2}(x, x).$$

As a result,

$$\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{V}_N} \sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2} \mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}(X_n = X'_n = X''_n = x, \Theta > n)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2} \mathbf{P}^u(X_n = x, \theta_{dN} > n)\mathbf{P}^v(X_n = x, \theta_{dN} > n)\mathbf{P}^w(X_n = x, \theta_{dN} > n) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{8}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{c_2N^2\leq n\leq 2c_2N^2 \quad u_1+u_2+x_1+x_2+n \text{ even}} \left[q_{2c_2N^2}(x,x)\right]^3 \\
&\geq \frac{c_2N^2}{16}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\left[q_{2c_2N^2}(x,x)\right]^3 \\
&\geq \frac{c_2N^2}{16|\mathbb{V}_N|^2}\left[\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N} q_{2c_2N^2}(x,x)\right]^3 \geq \frac{c_2}{16c^2}\left[\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N} q_{2c_2N^2}(x,x)\right]^3.
\end{aligned}
$$

Where the last inequality is by the Hölder inequality. Using the Hölder inequality and (3.12) again, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N} q_{2c_2N^2}(x,x) \geq& \sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}_{dN}} q_{c_2N^2}(x,y)q_{c_2N^2}(y,x) \\
\geq& \frac{1}{4}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}_{dN}} \left[q_{c_2N^2}(x,y)\right]^2 \\
\geq& \frac{1}{4|\mathbb{V}_{dN}|}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\left(\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}_{dN}} q_{c_2N^2}(x,y)\right)^2 \\
\geq& \frac{|\mathbb{V}_N|}{4|\mathbb{V}_{dN}|}\min_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\left[\sum_y \mathbf{P}^x(X_{c_2N^2} = y, \theta_{dN} > c_2N^2)\right]^2 \\
\geq& \frac{1}{2cd}\min_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\left[\mathbf{P}^x(\theta_{dN} > c_2N^2)\right]^2 \geq \frac{1}{4cd}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Take together,

$$
\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H) \geq \frac{c_2}{16c^2}\cdot\left(\frac{1}{4cd}\right)^3 \geq \frac{c_2}{2000c^5d^3}.
$$

So we have gotten the first part of (3.13).

Now we turn to the second moment, i.e., the second part of (3.13). Since that $\mathrm{Comb}(\mathbb{Z}, f)$ is a graph with uniformly bounded degree, there exists $c_1^* > 0$, such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{V}$

$$
\mathbf{P}^x(X_k = y) \leq \frac{c_1^*}{\sqrt{k}}.
$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}^{x,x,x}\left(X_k=X_k'=X_k''\right)=\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}}\mathbf{E}^{x,x,x}\big(X_k=X_k'=X_k''=y\big)\\
&=\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}}\left[\mathbf{P}^x(X_k=y)\right]^3\le\frac{(c_1^*)^2}{k}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}}\mathbf{P}^x(X_k=y)=\frac{(c_1^*)^2}{k}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the inequality above and the strong Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}\left(H^2\right)\\
=&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}1_{\{X_n=X_n'=X_n''=x,\Theta>n\}}\sum_{k=0}^{2c_2N^2}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{V}_N}1_{\{X_k=X_k'=X_k''=y,\Theta>k\}}\right)\\
\le&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)+2\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}1_{\{X_n=X_n'=X_n''=x,\Theta>n\}}\sum_{k>n}^{2c_2N^2}1_{\{X_k=X_k'=X_k''\}}\right)\\
=&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)+2\sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{k>n}^{2c_2N^2}\mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}\left(X_n=X_n'=X_n''=x,\Theta>n,X_k=X_k'=X_k''\right)\\
=&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)+2\sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{k>n}^{2c_2N^2}\mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}\left(X_n=X_n'=X_n''=x,\Theta>n\right)\mathbf{P}^{x,x,x}\left(X_{k-n}=X_{k-n}'=X_{k-n}''\right)\\
\le&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)+2\sum_{n=0}^{2c_2N^2}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\mathbf{P}^{u,v,w}\left(X_n=X_n'=X_n''=x,\Theta>n\right)\sum_{k=1}^{2c_2N^2}\mathbf{P}^{x,x,x}\left(X_k=X_k'=X_k''\right)\\
\le&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)\left(1+2\max_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{k=1}^{2c_2N^2}\mathbf{P}^{x,x,x}\left(X_k=X_k'=X_k''\right)\right)\\
\le&\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H)\left(1+2\max_{x\in\mathbb{V}_N}\sum_{k=1}^{2c_2N^2}\frac{(c_1^*)^2}{k}\right)\\
\le&\left(1+2(c_1^*)^2\log(2c_2)+4(c_1^*)^2\log N\right)\mathbf{E}^{u,v,w}(H).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have verified the second part of (3.13) and finished the proof of the lemma. □

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* For each $m\ge 1$, define event

$$\Upsilon_m=\{X_n=X_n'=X_n''\quad\text{for some}\quad n\in[\theta_{d^m}\wedge\theta_{d^m}'\wedge\theta_{d^m}'',\theta_{d^{m+1}}\wedge\theta_{d^{m+1}}'\wedge\theta_{d^{m+1}}'')\}.$$

Then by the strong Markov property and Lemma 3.2, for all $m$ large enough

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}(\Upsilon_m | 1_{\Upsilon_i}, 1 \le i < m,\ X_n, X'_n, X''_n,\ n \le \Theta_{d^m}) \\
=&\mathbf{P}^{X_t, X'_t, X''_t}\big(X_n = X'_n = X''_n \text{ for some } n \in [\theta_{d^m} \wedge \theta'_{d^m} \wedge \theta''_{d^m}, \theta_{d^{m+1}} \wedge \theta'_{d^{m+1}} \wedge \theta''_{d^{m+1}})\big) \\
\ge&\frac{c_5}{\log d^m} = \frac{c_5}{m \log d},
\end{aligned}$$

where $t = \theta_{d^m} \wedge \theta'_{d^m} \wedge \theta''_{d^m}$. By the second Borel Cantelli Lemma (extend version, Page 237 of [4]),

$$\mathbf{P}(\ \Upsilon_m \quad \text{infinitely} \quad \text{often}\ ) = 1.$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n = X'_n = X''_n \quad \text{infinitely} \quad \text{often}\ ) \ge \mathbf{P}(\ \Upsilon_m \quad \text{infinitely} \quad \text{often}\ ) = 1.$$

Thus we completed the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

# 4 A Related Result

**Theorem 4.1** *Let $f(x) = |x| \log^\beta(|x| \vee 1)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $\beta > 2$, then the total number of collisions by two independent simple random walks on Comb($\mathbb{Z}, f$) is almost surely finite.*

The proof of the theorem is almost the same as the case $f(x) = x^\alpha$ for $\alpha > 1$ in [1]. So we just outline the changes needed to run the proof.

**Lemma 4.1** *Let $f(x) = |x| \log^\beta(|x| \vee 1)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $x = (k, h) \in \mathbb{V}$. Then the transition density $q$ satisfies:*

$$q_t(0, x) \le \frac{c}{n^2 \log^\beta n} \quad \text{if} \quad t = n^3 \log^\beta n \quad \text{and} \quad n \ge k,$$

$$q_t(0, x) \le \frac{c}{k^2 \log^\beta k} \quad \text{if} \quad t = n^3 \log^\beta n \quad \text{and} \quad n < k.$$

**Proof.** Prove similarly as Lemma 5.1 of [1]. □

Set $Q_{k,h}$, where $h \le k \log^\beta k$, as follows:

$$Q_{k,h} = \{(k, y) : 0 \le y \le h\}.$$

We set $Z_{k,h} = Z(Q_{k,h})$ to be the number of collisions of the two random walks in $Q_{k,h}$. We also define $\widetilde{Z} = Z_{k,2h/3} - Z_{k,h/3}$, i.e. the number of collisions that happen in the set $\{(k, y) : \frac{h}{3} \le y \le \frac{2h}{3}\}$.

**Lemma 4.2** *$\mathbf{E}(Z_{k,h}) \le ch/(k \log^\beta k)$; and $\mathbf{E}(Z_{k,h} | \widetilde{Z}_{k,h} > 0) \ge ch$.*

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}(Z_{k,h}) =& \sum_t \sum_{x \in Q_{k,h}} q_t(0, x)^2 \le \sum_{t < k^3 \log^\beta k} \frac{ch}{k^4 \log^{2\beta} k} + \sum_{t \ge k^3 \log^\beta k} \frac{ch}{g(t)^2} \\
\le& \frac{ch}{k \log^\beta k} + ch \int_{k^3 \log^\beta k}^\infty \frac{1}{g(t)^2} dt \\
=& \frac{ch}{k \log^\beta k} + ch \int_k^\infty \frac{1}{h^4 \log^{2\beta} h} d(h^3 \log^\beta h) \\
=& \frac{ch}{k \log^\beta k} + ch \int_k^\infty \frac{3}{h^2 \log^\beta h} dh + ch \int_k^\infty \frac{\beta}{h^2 \log^{\beta+1} h} dh \\
\le& \frac{c' h}{k \log^\beta k},
\end{aligned}$$

where $n = g(t)$ is the inverse function of $t = n^3 \log^\beta n$. The second inequality is proved similarly as Lemma 5.2 of [1]. □

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* By Lemma 4.2

$$\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{Z}_{k,h} > 0) \le \frac{1}{k \log^\beta k}.$$

Now summing over all $k$ and over all $h$ ranging over powers of 2 and satisfying $h \le k \log^\beta k$, we get that

$$\sum_k \sum_{h \text{ power of } 2} \mathbf{P}(\widetilde{Z}_{k,h} > 0) \le \sum_k \frac{\log_2(k \log^\beta k)}{k \log^\beta k} < \infty, \text{ since } \beta > 2.$$

Hence the total number of collisions is finite almost surely. □

# References

[1] Barlow, M.T., Peres, Y., Sousi, P., Collisions of Random Walks, *Preprint*, (2010).

[2] Chen, X., Chen, D., Two random walks on the open cluster of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ meet infinitely often. *Science China Mathematics*, **53**, 1971-1978 (2010).

[3] Chen. D., Wei, B. and Zhang, F., A note on the finite collision property of random walks. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **78**, 1742-1747, (2008).

[4] Durrett, R. *Probability: Theory and Examples*, 3rd ed. Brooks/Cole, Belmont, 2005.

[5] Krishnapur, M. and Peres,Y., Recurrent graphs where two independent random walks collide finitely often. *Elect. Comm. in Probab.* **9**, 72-81, (2004).

[6] Polya, G., *George Polya: Collected Papers*, Volume IV, 582-585, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[7] Révész, P., *Random walk in random and non-random environments.* World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., 2005.